

Amdt. dated February 3, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 4, 2003

Serial No. 09/478,974
Docket No. ST999111
Firm No. 0055.0013

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. Claims 6, 14, and 22 have been amended to correct a minor error and place them in better form. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments and the remarks below.

In paragraph 3, the Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18, and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Seki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,570,597) in view of Barker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,659). Applicant traverses these rejections for the following reasons.

Claim 1 also describes that when the field of data includes a separator indicating that there are multiple values for the field, a first portion of the field of data and a graphical element indicating that there is a second portion of the field of data are displayed in a page and the page is enabled to selectively present the first and second portions of the field of data in response to user input. For example, the Specification at page 7, lines 19-28 describes that when a separator indicates multiple values for a field, the first value before the separator is encoded into the display box along with an information symbol that denotes there is further information for the field.

The Office Action cites the Seki patent at Col. 6, lines 5-58 as teaching "when the field of data includes a separator indicating that there are multiple values for the field". The cited portion of the Seki patent describes creation of an object management table that is created for each main data item, where the main data item is managed as an object and sub-data are managed as records. A document containing objects does not teach or suggest a field of data that includes a separator indicating that there are multiple values for a field.

The Office Action cites Col. 1, lines 49-62 as describing a "main icon representative of main data, and a sub-icon display unit that displays a sub-icon representative of sub-data together with the main icon if the sub-data form a part of the main data" and as teaching displaying in a page a first portion of the field of data and a graphical element indicating that there is a second

Amdt. dated February 3, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 4, 2003

Serial No. 09/478,974
Docket No. ST999111
Firm No. 0055.0013

portion of the field of data within a display area. The use of a main icon and a sub-icon teaches away from the display of a portion of the field of data (e.g., a first author name) and a graphical element. For example, Applicants' FIG. 3 illustrates that a portion of the field is displayed instead of an icon, whereas the Seki patent displays an icon for the main document (e.g., FIG. 1 of the Seki patent). Displaying an icon for the main document would require a user to select the icon to view any part of the main document. On the other hand, the Applicants' claimed invention displays a first portion of the field of data instead of an icon representing the first portion of the field of data. Thus, the Seki patent teaches away from Applicants' claimed invention.

Additionally, in the claimed invention, when the field of data includes a separator indicating that there are *multiple values for the field*, a first portion of the field of data and a graphical element indicating that there is a second portion of the field of data are displayed in a page, where the second portion of the field of data contains all of the remaining values. That is, regardless of how many values are in a field, a single graphical element indicating that there is a second portion of the field of data is displayed. On the other hand, the Seki patent would display a different icon for each of the multiple values (e.g., different sub-icons for object B and for object C). Again, the Seki patent teaches away from Applicants' claimed invention.

Claim 1 describes retrieving one or more records matching a search criteria, wherein each record includes at least one field of data. The Office Action cites the Barker patent as teaching retrieving one or more records that match a search criteria. When the Barker and Seki patents are combined, the combination does not result in Applicant's claimed invention. For example, the Seki patent teaches that for multiple objects in a document (or multiple values in a field of data), separate icons are displayed. This teaches away from displaying a portion of the field of data and one graphical element for the remaining portion of the field of data.

Thus, claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the Seki patent or the Baker patent, either alone or in combination.

Amdt. dated February 3, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 4, 2003

Serial No. 09/478,974
Docket No. ST999111
Firm No. 0055.0013

Independent claims 9 and 17 are not taught or suggested by the Seki patent or the Baker patent, either alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 incorporate the language of independent claims 1, 9, or 17, respectively, and add additional novel elements. Therefore, dependent claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 are not taught or suggested by the Seki patent or the Baker patent, either alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claims 1, 9, and 17.

Additionally, claim 4 describes that the page is an HTML page and that an HTML alternative text attribute element is used to enable the page to selectively present the first and second portions of the field of data in response to user input. The Office Action cites the Barker patent at Col. 4, lines 51-59, which indicates that the client/server environment may include the Internet. However, if the Barker and Seki patents are combined, the result is that a main icon and a sub-icon are displayed. This teaches away from using an HTML alternative text attribute element is used to enable the page to selectively present the first and second portions of the field of data in response to user input.

Claim 5 describes receiving a user request including the search criteria and querying a database on the search criteria to access data records satisfying the search criteria, wherein each accessed data record includes the field of data, wherein there is a display area for each record, further comprising displaying in the display area for each record the at least first portion of the field of data from each accessed data record, wherein the page is enabled to selectively present the first and second portion of the field for the record in response to user input. Again, the combination of the Barker and Seki patents results in a main icon and a sub-icon being displayed. This teaches away from displaying in the display area for each record the at least first portion of the field of data from each accessed data record.

Claim 6 describes that displaying the first portion in the display area comprises displaying a first value in the data field, and wherein presenting the first and second portions in response to

Amdt. dated February 3, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 4, 2003

Serial No. 09/478,974
Docket No. ST999111
Firm No. 0055.0013

user input comprise displaying all the values from the data field. Because the combination of the Barker and Seki patents results in displaying a main icon and a sub-icon, the combination teaches away from displaying a first value in the data field.

In paragraph 4, the Office Action rejects claims 3, 11, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Seki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,570,597) in view of Barker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,659) and in further view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (APA). Applicant traverses these rejections for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 are not taught or suggested by the Seki patent, the Baker patent, or Applicant Admitted Prior Art, either alone or together. For example, the discussion of hover text does not cure the defects of the Seki and Baker patents.

Applicant's Specification on page 1, lines 13-14, describes that one use of hover text is to display information on a control button or icon, such as shown in Applicant's Figure 1. Also, Applicant's Specification on page 1, lines 17-21, describes that another use of hover text is to crop content to fit into a display area and then provide the entire content of the display area in a hover text box. Applicant's Specification on page 2, lines 2-6, describes that if the title of a button extends beyond the width of the button, then the application title is truncated to fit the button, and, if the user passes a graphical pointer over the displayed button, the entire title is displayed in hover text. None of these prior art uses of hover text teach or suggest retrieving one or more records matching a search criteria, wherein each record includes at least one field of data, and, when the field of data includes a separator indicating that there are multiple values for the field, displaying a first portion of the field of data and a graphical element indicating that there is a second portion of the field of data.

Dependent claims 3, 11, and 19 incorporate the language of independent claims 1, 9, or 17, respectively, and add additional novel elements. Therefore, dependent claims 3, 11, and 19 are not taught or suggested by the Takasu patent or Applicant's description of related art in

Amdt. dated February 3, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 4, 2003

Serial No. 09/478,974
Docket No. ST999111
Firm No. 0055.0013

Applicant's Specification, either alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claims 1, 9, and 17.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-24 are patentable over the art of record. Applicant has not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact her at (310) 553-7973 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: February 3, 2004

By: Janaki K. Davda
Janaki K. Davda
Registration No. 40,684

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes Victor & Mann, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984